

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-8, 11-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 14-17, 20-23, 26, 28, 29, and 32 have been amended. Reconsideration of the rejections of all claims and allowance are earnestly solicited in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The specification has been objected to for various informalities. Appropriate corrections have been made. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, it was stated that the Examiner fails to understand how the brief XAML set forth in “Expression 1” of Applicant’s specification is used to generate the records illustrated in Figure 4 that appear to include many XAML elements that are not found in Expression 1. Moreover, the Office Action stated that the Examiner fails to see how the XAML in Expression 1 is “optimized,” as recited in Claim 1, when converting a XAML to a binary record in Figure 4. The Examiner believes that this is a paradox as the XAML is “brief” and the binary record in Figure 4 is comparatively large.

Expression 1 is meant to provide an example of the statements in paragraph 27, which describes the information records and structure records. Expression 1 is not meant to be an example of the overall innovation, which is an optimized binary format encoding the structure represented by a XAML stream. As stated in paragraph 24, the mapping engine includes parser logic, tables, and other associated resources. These associated

resources include the information that is stored in information records, and, in this example, include the other elements shown in Figure 4 that are not found in Expression 1.

A more complete example of the translation from XAML to the optimized binary format may include examples of the other aspects of this invention, including the hosting of comment attributes (paragraph 24), implicit structure records (paragraph 29), and identification of associated classes (paragraph 32).

Claim Objections

Claims 11-16 and claims 17-22 have been objected to as being substantial duplicates of each other. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Two different classes of statutory subject matter are being claimed within each claim set: claims 11-16 are directed towards a method and claims 17-22 are directed to an optimized binary representation embodied on a tangible computer readable medium. As such, Applicant is entitled to claim protection for both classes of statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-8 and 11-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Appropriate corrections have been made. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 15, 17, 21, 23, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,007,105, in view of Lewallen, U.S. Patent No. 6,801,224. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Sullivan is directed towards a method and system for improving the transmission and storage of documents utilizing markup languages (See Sullivan Abstract). Within the method, Sullivan discloses converting tags within a markup language document to tokens (See Sullivan col. 4 lines 26-29). Sullivan further discloses each character within the markup tag being translated to a binary representation (See Sullivan col. 1 lines 55-61).

However, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Sullivan does not teach the feature of an optimized binary representation comprising an indexed first instance of a novel object type and an embedded identifier to invoke an associated loader as recited in each of the independent claims. The Office Action introduces Lewallen to allegedly teach this feature of the independent claims. Lewallen is directed towards a system and method for generating an application graphical user interface (UI) window used by an executing application program (See Lewallen Abstract). The Office Action alleges that Lewallen teaches a bridge that indexes a first instance of a novel object type and that embeds an identifier to invoke an associated loader. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The independent claims each recite that a binary representation is generated to include an indexed first instance of a novel object type and an embedded identifier and is then transmitted to an external device. Support for this can at least be found in the originally filed claims 9 and 10 and paragraphs 31-34 of Applicant's specification. Lewallen does not teach or suggest this limitation. Even if Lewallen discusses a bridge indexing a first instance of a novel object type and embedding an identifier to invoke an associated loader as the Office Action alleges, Lewallen does not teach an optimized binary representation comprising an indexed first instance of a novel object type and an embedded identifier to invoke an associated loader. Firstly, the bridge is not an

optimized binary representation of markup language information. Furthermore, even if the bridge includes an indexed first instance of a novel object type and an embedded identifier, Lewallen does not teach that the bridge, indexed first instance of a novel object type, and embedded identifier are transmitted to external resources as recited in the independent claims. The bridge is a computer architecture component that resides on a computer machine. The bridge is not transmitted to an external resource, and therefore, any alleged indexed novel object types and embedded identifiers taught by Lewallen are not transmitted to external resources. Therefore, Sullivan and Lewallen, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 11, 17, 23, and 29.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not be motivated to combine Sullivan and Lewallen. Sullivan involves optimizing the storage and transmission of documents formatted in markup languages for economic and efficiency purposes. Contrastingly, Lewallen involves providing a method for allowing plug-ins that are embedded and executed within an area of a web browser to implement and take advantage web browser graphical user interface component abilities outside the area of execution. Lewallen is not involved with nor is related to optimizing the storage and transmission of documents formatted in markup languages. Moreover, Lewallen does not provide any teachings or suggestions for improving the storage and transmission of documents formatted in markup languages. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the claim rejections as one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to combine Sullivan with Lewallen.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and therefore define over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 6 and 7 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Claim 15 depends from claim 11 and therefore defines over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 11. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on claim 11.

Claim 21 depends from claim 17 and therefore defines over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 17. Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on claim 17.

Claim 27 depends from claim 23 and therefore defines over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 23. Accordingly, claim 27 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on claim 23.

Claims 2-5, 8, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-26, 28, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan, in view of Lewallen, and further in view of Wei, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0143823. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Wei, whether taken alone or in combination with Sullivan and Lewallen, fails to cure the deficiencies found in Sullivan and Lewallen regarding teaching or suggesting all limitations of the independent claims. Therefore, claims 2-5, 8, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-26, 28, and 30-32 define over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-8, and 11-32 are pending in this application. In view of the amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be allowed and passed to issue. Should any issues remain prior to issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.110233.

Respectfully submitted,

/Tremayne M. Norris/

Tremayne M. Norris
Reg. No. 58,683

Date: November 13, 2006

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: (816) 474-6550